

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 34-93 are pending in this application with claims 34, 35, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, and 65 being the independent claims. Claims 1-33 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 64-93 have been added. Claims 64 and 65 correspond to claims 32 and 33, respectively, written in independent form.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Office Action on pages 2-8, in sections 3-14, rejects claims 1-20 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,875,249 to Mintzer et al. Claims 1-20 and 27-31 have been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action on pages 8-16, in sections 15-30, rejects claims 32-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,249 to Mintzer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,941 to Wong. Claims 32 and 33 have been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to claims 32 and 33. As per claims 34-63, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, claim 34 recites an image processing system comprising an image providing system that defines "a location information indicating a plurality of regions in an image file for embedding a digital watermark in a desired region among the plurality of regions." In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, by embedding a digital watermark in a desired region among the plurality of regions, the image processing may advantageously process an image within a short time and at a small cost, because the digital watermark may be embedded only in the necessary part so that the quantity of the information of the image file itself can decrease. Then, the

image compression may become small and save the storing space for storing the image file. See, e.g., Specification, page 87, lines 6-12.

Neither Mintzer nor Wong teach embedding a digital watermark in a desired region among the plurality of regions. Instead, Mintzer and Wong teach the stamp of a watermark into the whole area of an image. See, Mintzer, col. 4, lines 32-49; Wong, col. 4, lines 20-22. Stamping the watermark onto the whole area of the image does not save resources as discussed above. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were to combine these references, such a combination would not result in the invention as claimed in claim 34 because neither Mintzer nor Wong teach or suggest embedding a digital watermark in a desired region among the plurality of regions. Hence claim 34 is allowable over the cited combination of Mintzer and Wong.

Independent claims 35, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, and 65 contain similar recitations as claim 34 and are allowable for similar reasons, as discussed above with respect to claim 34.

The remaining dependent claims 36-42, 45-48, 51, 54-57, 60, 63, and 66-93 depend variously from independent claims 34, 35, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, and 65, and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: May 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 41,289

Daniel G. Vivarelli, Jr.

Registration No.: 51,137

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant

DC2/549213